

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are all the pending claims in the application, each of which is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass in view of Laiho. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner admits that Glass has deficiencies with regard to “link based on the received response,” and cites Laiho to modify Glass. Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Glass with Laiho. And even if the teachings of Glass were modified based on Laiho, all the limitations of the claim would not be met.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the reference teachings. Further, modification cannot render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. MPEP 2145.

In the Office Action it is asserted that Glass teaches all the elements of claim 1 except for modifying a document containing the “link based on the received response.” See page 3 of the Office Action. Laiho is relied upon for teaching this feature at page 7.

Glass is directed to modifying a document that contains a broken hypertext link. It is respectfully submitted that Glass is not directed to determining if a location of a resource has changed, as recited in claim 1.

Glass discloses that a requestor of documents may receive a "File Not Found" error when the requested document could not be retrieved due to various problems. For example, the error might be because a communication link linking the user to the server is down, the server itself might be down, or the link pointing to the requested document might contain a typographical error. When a server receives the error, it retrieves the originating document containing the broken link and modifies a presentation attribute of the broken link and stores the modified document. For example, the color can be changed from its normal presentation, commonly blue, to a color indicating a broken link, such as red or yellow. Thus, Glass modifies the originating document to highlight the fact that the particular link has been determined broken. Glass, however, does not disclose determining if a location of a resource specified by a link has changed.

The Office Action states that Laiho, at page 7, discloses this feature missing from Glass. Laiho discloses sending a correction message to a client's browser notifying the browser that the requested URL is out of date and providing the new URL if it is determined that the page corresponding to the requested URL has moved. The browser then is redirected to the new URL.

Glass and Laiho teach alternative solutions with respect to a broken link to a requested document. One contemplating the Glass solution would find modifying the teachings of Glass based on Laiho would render the Glass solution unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Glass teaches modifying the presentation attribute of a broken link contained in a document. Therefore, it is desirable to keep the modified document displayed on the screen so that the user is able to see the modification. Laiho, on the other hand, teaches redirecting the browser to

another URL. If Laiho is used to modify Glass, when the user clicks on a broken link contained in an originating document, the user sees the browser redirecting to a new URL, while being fully unaware of the modifications in the originating document taught by Glass. This would have rendered the Glass solution unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Therefore, there is no motivation to modify Glass with Laiho.

The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to combine Glass's method of finding broken links and Laiho's process of finding the location of incorrect links and correcting them. Applicant respectfully submits that it is well settled that the proper inquiry for obviousness is what the reference as a whole teaches or suggests to those of ordinary skill in the art. It is also well settled that one cannot pick and choose among the features disclosed or taught by the prior art in determining obviousness. Laiho as a whole teaches redirecting the browser to a new URL if the originally requested URL is a broken link and not modifying or correcting a document, as alleged in the Office Action. The Examiner must make the inquiry for obviousness on what Laiho as a whole teaches or suggests to those of ordinary skill, and should not pick and choose among the features disclosed in Laiho. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that an artisan of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to modify the teachings of Glass with the teachings of Laiho as asserted in the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable for at least these reasons.

The remaining claims are patentable at least for the same reasons discussed above for claim 1.

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116**  
**U. S. Application No. 10/078,419**

**Our Ref: A8507**  
**Art Unit: 2145**

Claims 18 and 19 are also patentable at least because neither Glass nor Laiho discloses or suggests "a link status code indicating whether the resource is present."

Claims 24-26 are also patentable at least because neither Glass nor Laiho discloses or suggests "a status code indicating a status of the second prior resource-locator."

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Respectfully submitted,



J. Warren Lytle, Jr.  
Registration No. 39,283

Date: July 17, 2006